



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.        | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/660,945  | 09/12/2003  | Erik P. Staats       | APPL-P2829COA              | 6999                   |
| 65201 7590 01/31/2008<br>GAZDZINSKI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.<br>11440 WEST BERNARDO COURT<br>SUITE 375<br>SAN DIEGO, CA 92127 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>PAULA, CESAR B |                        |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2178           | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>01/31/2008    | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,945

Applicant(s)

STAATS, ERIK P.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 14-17, 22 and 26-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 14-17, 22, 26-38 and 40-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: 1/22/08.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This supplemental action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/20/2007.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 11-13, 18-21, and 23-25 have been canceled. Claims 30-44 have been added. Claims 1-5, and 14-17, 22, and 26-44 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 22, 26, 31, 37, and 41 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claims 1-5, 11-18, and 22, 26-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Looney et al, hereinafter Looney (Pat.# 6,232,539 B1, 5/15/2001, continuation filed on 6/17/1998), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

#### *Priority*

4. This application is a continuation of co-pending United States Patent Application Serial Number 09/429,233, now pat. 6691096, filed October 28, 1999.

#### *Drawings*

5. The drawings filed on 9/12/2003 have been accepted by the Examiner.

#### *Double Patenting*

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-5 remain rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-4, and 1 respectively of **U.S. Patent No. 6,691,096-B1, hereinafter 096** in view of Looney (Pat.# 6,232,539 B1, 5/15/2001, continuation filed on 6/17/1998).

Regarding claim 1, 096 teaches the limitations of these claims, except for *present the hierarchy to a device requesting data*. However, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines 21-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from

the properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine 096, and Humpleman, because of all the reasons found in Humpleman, including being able to command and control a device without having to know any specific details about the particular device (col.6, lines 58-67).

This is a double patenting rejection.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

8. The restriction of previously submitted claims 19-21, and 23-25 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed, are moot in light of the cancellation of the claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 17, 22, and 28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11. Claims 17, 22, and 28 still, and 40 (newly added) recite the limitation "the AV/C general specification" in lines 4, 8, and 3 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this

limitation in the claim. It is not clear which specification the Applicant refers to, since there is still no previous "AV/C general specification" in the claims to refer to. There are many AV/C specification versions. The specification points to the "General Specification", not the "AV/C general specification" as being the rev. 3.0 of the AV/C Digital Interface Command Set General specification (0007).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1-5, 11-16, 26-27, 29-35, 37, and 40-44 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al (Pat.# 6192094 B1, 1/30/2001, filed on 6/24/1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are GIF files that are retrieved from the respective home devices

(col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)-- *compile a plurality of containers from audio visual control descriptor data.*

Furthermore, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines 21-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from the properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. The webpage is displayed with the buttons included within it. Accessing a home device button will only retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage-- *register one or more fields of said audio visual control descriptor data within each said container; arrange said containers into a logical hierarchy; present or display the hierarchy to a device requesting data; wherein said device requesting data can access individual ones of said plurality of containers thereby accessing portions of said audio visual control descriptor data without having to access all of said audio visual control descriptor data.*

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Each device button contains the device name within it (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)-- *associating addresses with each of said fields sequentially enumerated within each of said containers.*

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and

display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)-- *mapping said fields to a prescribed field list.*

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)-- *accessing any field within any container independently of any other container, and reading data from any field within any container without affecting the access to any other container.*

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are GIF files that are retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)- *said plurality of containers comprise in combination an audio visual control general object list descriptor.*

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 1, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)-- *at least one of said plurality of containers comprises a direct representation of a data field in an audio visual control descriptor.*



Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A). The button is directly associated with the home device control link-- -- *wherein at least one of said plurality of containers comprises an alternate representation of a second audio visual control descriptor field.*

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's control webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)-- *at least one of said plurality of containers comprises information on how to produce a third audio visual control descriptor field.*

Regarding independent claim 26, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are GIF files that are retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)-- *compile a plurality of containers containing media control descriptor data.*

Further, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines 21-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from the properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a

HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. The webpage is displayed with the buttons included within it. Accessing a home device button will only retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage *arrange said containers into a logical hierarchy; present or display the hierarchy to a device requesting data*

Furthermore, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons, with static hyperlinks, for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are represented by a description of the device, and/or GIF files that could alternatively be retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)- *wherein said plurality of containers each comprise one or more data fields of an audio visual control descriptor data, wherein a first data field in a first one of said plurality of containers comprises a static data field and a second data field in a second one of said plurality of containers comprises a dynamic data field.*

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 26, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons, with static hyperlinks, for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are represented by a description of the device, and/or GIF files that could alternatively be retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)-- *wherein at least one of said plurality of containers comprises an alternate representation of a second audio visual control descriptor field.*

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 26, Humpleman discloses grouping the buttons in accordance to the location of the devices. The communication, and retrieval from the home devices is performed in accordance to the 1394 communications protocol (col.13, lines 57-67, col.4, lines 20-67, fig. 7). In other words, the retrieved icon data is identified. The sorting parameters are indicated. Then the icon data is read and reorganized and copied into memory where it is retrieved to be displayed to the user-- *identify a top level data container containing AV/C descriptor data. initialize compilation attributes; read the container data; and copy said read container data into a readable storage area.*

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 26, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)—*access any field within any container independently without affecting the access of any other container; and write data to any dynamic data field without affecting the access to any other container.*

Regarding independent claim 31, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are GIF files that are retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)-- *compile a plurality of containers from audio visual control descriptor data.*

Furthermore, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines

21-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from the properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. The webpage is displayed with the buttons included within it. Accessing a home device button will only retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage--  
*register one or more fields of said audio visual control descriptor data within each said container; arrange said containers into a logical hierarchy; wherein individual ones of said plurality of containers associated with said audio visual control descriptor data are accessible by a device without affecting access to any other container, thereby allowing said plurality of containers to be substantially independent from another.*

Regarding independent claim 37, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines 21-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from the properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. The webpage is displayed with the buttons included within it. Accessing a home device button will only retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage *read a media control descriptor data comprising a first format; comprising of container a plurality of containers containing said media control descriptor data, said plurality of containers comprising a second format; arrange said containers into a logical hierarchy; present or display the hierarchy to a device requesting data*

Regarding claim 40, which depends on claim 37, Humpleman discloses grouping the buttons in accordance to the location of the devices. The communication, and retrieval from the home devices is performed in accordance to the 1394 communications protocol (col.13, lines 57-67, col.4, lines 20-67, fig. 7).—*said media control descriptor data is compliant with the AV/C general specification.*

Regarding independent claim 41, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines 21-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from the properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. The webpage is displayed with the buttons included within it. Accessing a home device button will only retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage *compile a plurality of containers containing media control descriptor data, said media control descriptor data comprising a plurality of data fields; arrange said containers into a logical hierarchy, each said containers comprising one or more of said plurality of data fields; present or display the hierarchy to a device requesting data*

Furthermore, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons, with static hyperlinks, for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are represented by a description of the device, and/or GIF

files that could alternatively be retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)- *wherein a first data field of said plurality of data fields comprises a static data field in a first container and a second data field in said plurality of data fields comprises a dynamic data field in a second container.*

Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 41, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)-- *access said static data field in said first container without affecting the access to said dynamic data field in said second container.*

Claims 31-35, and 43-44 are directed towards a computer readable medium like the one found in claims 1-5, and 2-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 17, 22, 28, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Humpleman discloses grouping the buttons in accordance to the location of the devices. The communication, and retrieval from the home devices is performed in accordance to the 1394 communications protocol (col.13, lines 57-67, col.4, lines 20-67, fig. 7). Humpleman fails to explicitly teach *recompiles said plurality of containers containing audio visual control descriptor data into a format compliant with the AV/C General specification*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use data compliant with the specification, because of all the reasons found in Humpleman, including being able to command and control a device without having to know any specific details about the particular device (col.6, lines 58-67). This would have enabled a user to access effectively the command and control data appropriating any communications protocol.

Regarding independent claim 22, Humpleman discloses an auto-tree builder using a device list file to create a device HTML file that contains buttons for each home device connected to the home network. The buttons are GIF files that are retrieved from the respective home devices (col.13, lines 16-27, and 39-67, fig. 4, and 6)-- *compile a plurality of containers from audio visual control descriptor data*.

Furthermore, Humpleman discloses obtaining a property file information and respective URL of the device to convert a button to a hypertext link to the individual device (col.13, lines 21-67, col. 4, lines 20-67, fig. 12-17). In other words, the information retrieved from the

properties file is inserted into the button to customize the button to point to the appropriate device. The buttons are now part of a HTML hierarchy, where the device file of webpage is linked to the various webpages of the home devices. The webpage is displayed with the buttons included within it. Accessing a home device button will only retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage-- *arrange said containers into a logical hierarchy; present or display the hierarchy to a device requesting data; wherein said device requesting data can access individual ones of said plurality of containers thereby accessing portions of said audio visual control descriptor data without having to access all of said audio visual control descriptor data.* Humpleman fails to explicitly teach *wherein said plurality of containers, in combination, comprise an audio visual control general descriptor compliant with the AV/C general specification.* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use data compliant with the specification, because of all the reasons found in Humpleman, including being able to command and control a device without having to know any specific details about the particular device (col.6, lines 58-67). This would have enabled a user to access effectively the command and control data appropriating any communications protocol.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 26, Humpleman discloses grouping the buttons in accordance to the location of the devices. The communication, and retrieval from the home devices is performed in accordance to the 1394 communications protocol (col.13, lines 57-67, col.4, lines 20-67, fig. 7)-- Humpleman fails to explicitly teach *at least one instruction which when executed recompiles said plurality of containers containing audio visual control descriptor data into a format compliant with the AV/C General specification.* It would have been



obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use data compliant with the specification, because of all the reasons found in Humpleman, including being able to command and control a device without having to know any specific details about the particular device (col.6, lines 58-67). This would have enabled a user to access effectively the command and control data appropriating any communications protocol.

Regarding claim 38, which depends on claim 37, Humpleman discloses converting a button to a hypertext link to the individual device. Accessing a home device button will retrieve and display the respective home device's webpage (col.13, lines 21-57, fig. 5A)—*said plurality of containers are individually accessible by a device requesting data thereby allowing access to an individual container without affecting the access to any other container containing said media control descriptor data*. Humpleman fails to explicitly teach *wherein absent said plurality of containers, said media control descriptor data would have to be accessed as a whole*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access the properties file without having to retrieve the individual properties, because of all the reasons found in Humpleman including having all the properties in a single file (col.13, lines 16-29). This would have enabled a user to access quickly all of the properties in the file.

16. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman, in view of Looney et al, hereinafter Looney (Pat.# 6,232,539 B1, 5/15/2001, continuation filed on 6/17/1998).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 31, Humpleman discloses displaying and allowing a user to select controls for various devices (col.17, lines 36-67, col.18, lines 33-67, fig.10-13). Humpleman fails to explicitly disclose *establishing a read buffer in a memory space and setting the read buffer offset to zero; establishing a received address request as a starting address, establishing a received read length request as a length sought*. Looney discloses the queuing of a song to be played and setting a timer to 0. The user can then indicate the length of play time of a song selected to be played (col.2, lines 30-67, col.9, lines 33-47, col. 14, lines 37-50, col.10, lines 30-67, fig. 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access the properties file without having to combine Humpleman, and Looney, because of all the reasons found in Looney including taking advantage of the latest advances in music storage, and data processing capabilities (col.1, lines 52-60).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

17. Claim 39 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/20/2007 have been fully considered but they moot. Regarding claim 22, the Applicant indicates that Looney has not taught or suggested any data

compliant with the AV/C general specification (page 10). The Applicant is directed towards the rejection of this claim in light of the clarification of the term by the Applicant (page 9).

Regarding the rest of the claims, the Applicant is directed towards the rejection and/or objection of these claims above as necessitated by the amendment.

Additionally, the rejection of claim 36 has been included above as indicated by the Examiner in a telephonic message to Robert Gazdzinski on 1/14/2007.

***Conclusion***

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:  
10/660,945  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 19

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571 272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

  
**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
1/22/2008